THE Reconstructionist

Vol. IX. December 10, 1943 Kislev 13, 5704 No. 16

EDITORIALS
- *The UNRRA and the Relief and Rehabilitation of European Jews*
- *A National Service Agency for Jewish Education*
- *The Pending Social Security Bill*

HIGHER JEWISH EDUCATION AND THE EMERGING OF AMERICAN JEWRY
By Samuel M. Blumenfield

THE ROLE OF LOVE AND HATE IN OUR ETHICAL LIFE
By Theodore Friedman

MUSIC NOTES

BOOK NOTES

CORRESPONDENCE

Dedicated to the advancement of Judaism as a religious civilization, to the upbuilding of Israel's ancient homeland, and to the furtherance of universal freedom, justice and peace.

the Reconstructionist

is published bi-weekly for twenty consecutive issues, starting in October, by the Jewish Reconstructionist Foundation, Inc., 15 West 86th Street, New York 24, N. Y. Reentered as second class matter October 3, 1935, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879.

EDITORIAL BOARD

Chairman: Mordecai M. Kaplan
Associate Chairman: Ira Eisenstein
Managing Editor: Eugene Kohn

Associate Editors: Israel S. Chipkin, Samuel Dinin, Abraham G. Duker, Judith K. Eisenstein, Solomon Goldman, Jacob S. Golub, Bernard Heller, Philip Houtz, Samuel C. Kohs, Milton R. Konvitz, Theodore N. Lewis, Milton Steinberg.

Contributing Editors: Michael Alper, Nathan A. Barack, Shlomo Bardin, Morton M. Berman, Philip S. Bernstein, Asher Block, Samuel M. Blumenfield, Ben Zion Bokser, William J. Boxerman, Mortimer J. Cohen, Miriam R. Ephraim, Harry Essrig, Emanuel Gamoran, Judah I. Goldin, Robert Gordis, Emanuel Green, Max Kadushin, Louis M. Levitsky, Joshua Loth Liebman, I. D. Minzberg, Edward T. Sandrow, Simon Shetzer, Joshua Trachtenberg, Leo Trepp, Jacob J. Weinstein, Max Wiener.

AMONG OUR CONTRIBUTORS

Dr. Samuel M. Blumenfield is the Dean of the College of Jewish Studies in Chicago. He has written extensively on educational subjects.

▼

Rabbi Theodore Friedman, formerly Rabbi of Temple Beth David in Buffalo, N. Y., is now the spiritual leader of the Jackson Heights Jewish Center, N. Y.

▼

WITH ALL DUE MODESTY

From a leader of the Jewish Community:

As one who has steadily and conscientiously read the paper, I know that it has a far greater influence than many publications having far greater circulations. People respect *The Reconstructionist* and counsel appearing in its pages is heeded.

▼

From a Hadassah member:

This is my fifth year as director of a Reconstructionist study group. We are Reconstructionist-minded and find Prof. Kaplan's analysis stimulating and inspiring. The magazine is particularly helpful.

▼

From a Chaplain:

The Reconstructionist is really too valuable a journal to keep out of APO 502. Even in the South Pacific Islands it has avid readers.

ORDER NOW

your copies of the

SYLLABUS ON RECONSTRUCTIONISM

This syllabus contains the outlines of a series of ten lectures that together constitute a basic course in Reconstructionism. The first five lectures of the course deal with the *principles of Reconstructionism* and its historic background, the remaining five, with the *program of Reconstructionism* for Jewish life.

Each lecture outline is supplied with references, questions for discussion, and, in the case of the last five lectures, with suggestions for projects which the group might wish to undertake in implementation of the program.

The first four lectures will be sent you on receipt of your orders. Others will be sent out at frequent intervals, so that groups beginning the course now will not have to interrupt it for want of material.

These syllabi will be distributed free to study groups that send us the names and addresses of their members.

To obtain Reconstructionist diaries (25c each), syllabi, study aids, pamphlets, or further information regarding Reconstructionism,

apply to

THE JEWISH RECONSTRUCTIONIST FOUNDATION, Inc.

15 West Eighty-Sixth Street, New York 24, N. Y.

Telephone: SChuyler 4-7000

THE Reconstructionist

Vol. IX. December 10, 1943 Kislev 13, 5704 No. 16

EDITORIALS

THE UNRRA AND THE RELIEF AND REHABILITATION OF EUROPEAN JEWS

THE United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration (UNRRA), in its Subcommittee on Social Welfare Policies, listened to a plea by the World Jewish Congress and another by the Jewish Labor Committee to give special consideration to the needs of the Jews in Europe. The inhuman persecution to which Hitler has subjected the Jews and the sufferings, unparalleled among other peoples needing relief, which have resulted from that persecution entitle them to such consideration. Among the facts to which attention was called in the Congress memorandum presented by Drs. Stephen S. Wise and Nahum Goldman are the following:

In the feeding of the population, it must be borne in mind that the Jews, more than any other people, were systematically starved by the Nazis. They must therefore be assured of a food supply adequate to restore them to health. Their desire to conform to the kosher diet prescribed by their religious tradition should be respected.

Moreover, since Jewish children have for years been denied all opportunities for education, such education needs now to be provided for them.

The confiscation of Jewish homes and other property and the denial to Jews of opportunities to purchase goods, even within the usual ration restrictions, make their need for clothing and housing exceed that of the rest of the impoverished population. Since Jews have been subject to wholesale deportation and have no homes to return to, the rehabilitation of Jews demands provision for resettlement.

The appeals of the Congress and the Jewish Labor Committee were denied by the Subcommittee on Social Welfare Policies. This must not be construed as evidence of a lack of sympathy for Jewish suffering on the part of that committee. Its motive was the fear entertained by some of its members that the placing of Jews in a special category might militate against the effort to ameliorate Jewish-Gentile relations among peoples poisoned by anti-Semitic propaganda. One cannot say that there is no basis for such fears. Anti-Semitism exists even today among the populations of some of the occupied countries, and not all of it is of Nazi origin.

We respect the good intentions of the Subcommittee, and we trust that its decision not to treat Jews in a separate category when it comes to relief does not

mean that the special needs of Jews will be overlooked. Even in dealing with problems of relief—not to mention rehabilitation—some recognition ought to be given to the Jewishness of Jews. To restore physically weakened and mentally distraught human beings to normal living, one must reckon with the personal ties that bind them to their respective religious and kinship groups. Provision should therefore be made for the cooperation of such groups in their relief. Naturally, this does not apply to Jews alone; but it applies to them in greater measure than to all other people. We are, therefore, pleased to learn that "the resources, personnel and skill of voluntary agencies" will be used, according to the Subcommittee's report, "within such limits as may be imposed by necessity. . . . So far as feasible these agencies should be permitted to operate in the areas of their choice."

So far as administration of relief is concerned, that is perhaps as much as Jews have a right to expect at the present time. But when the time comes for UNRRA to pass from immediate relief of individuals to social reconstruction and rehabilitation, the special need of the Jewish people will call for differential treatment. It will then be impossible for intelligent men of good will to ignore the Jewish need for adequate political guarantees of protection and freedom. No other element in the population of Nazi-occupied territory has the same need as the Jews. For most of the non-Jews that have been driven from their homes into exile the opportunity to return home will mean welcome relief and the assurance of a friendly reception. Not so for the Jews. For them it would mean, in most instances, the opportunity to return to a hell from which they had escaped. They know that, regardless of their legal status under post-war treaties, they will be treated by the non-Jewish majority as unwelcome competitors for whatever economic opportunities may be available in the chaos of a war-wrecked world. Opportunities for the resettlement of Jews must therefore be provided. They must be given a chance to start life anew, and not merely their own personal careers but the communal life necessary to the satisfaction of their religious and cultural wants.

Above all, the Jews must never again be exposed to a situation in which one half of the world casts them out and the other half does not admit them. The pledge to enable the Jewish people to establish its national home in the land to which history has given it a clear title must be fulfilled; the White Paper policy must be rescinded and the doors of Palestine thrown wide open to Jewish immigration. And UNRRA should facilitate the process of that migration for Jewish refugees from Nazi persecution who desire to return to the national home of their people.

Perhaps the creation of these conditions necessary to the rehabilitation of European Jewry after the war goes beyond the powers assigned to UNRRA. But unless these conditions are met, UNRRA will fail of its purpose of bringing not only temporary relief but permanent rehabilitation to the persons and communities that have been wrecked by the Nazi storm.

A NATIONAL SERVICE AGENCY FOR JEWISH EDUCATION

DESPITE slow progress, American Jewry is gradually becoming more communally minded and better organized. It is fashioning agencies and institutions, locally and nationally, which reflect community need and organized communal purpose. Evidence of this growth is found in the rising number of local Federations, Welfare Funds, Community Councils, Bureaus of Jewish Education, and in the development of national coordinating agencies to

serve the technical needs of these local central agencies. Among the better known national coordinating agencies are the Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds and the Jewish Welfare Board, which serves Jewish Centers and kindred institutions. To these should be added the American Association for Jewish Education which has just announced the appointment of an executive director and an extensive program of field and technical services. This Association has been in existence officially for about a half dozen years, and has been helping communities to organize local central agencies for Jewish education as well as serving existing Bureaus of Jewish Education and kindred agencies.

Although the Association is the most recent of the national coordinating agencies serving local communal needs, local central agencies for Jewish education have preceded the establishment of local Federations, Welfare Funds and similar organizations. The first Bureau of Jewish Education was founded in New York City in 1910 under the leadership of Dr. Samson Benderly. Since then Bureaus of Jewish Education, Jewish Education Associations or Committees or Associations of Talmud Torahs were organized in more tions or Committees, or Associations of the country. These local central agencies for Jewish education as well as this national coordinating agency are the product of the efforts of forward-looking, devoted and community-minded lay leaders, who are interested in Jewish survival, in higher standards of Jewish communal activity, in more intelligent and more spiritual Jewish living and in a better quality of citizenship.

The program of services rendered by the American Association for Jewish Education is twofold in character, organizational and technical. Organizationally, these services are designed to help communities to develop an extensive program of Jewish education which will include all local Jews and their children, and which will be fully supported by all elements in the community, and out of community funds. In addition to organization of local Bureaus of Jewish Education, the program of the Association calls also for the establishment of regional divisions, where the lay and professional representatives of these agencies and communities can come together for periodic conferences to get acquainted, to exchange experiences and to plan cooperative regional programs of activity. Such regional divisions are already in existence in the East Central, West Central and New England States. Others are in formation in the Western and Southern States. Once a year the Association also provides a national forum at its annual meetings for these representatives to decide upon program and officers. A very important aspect of the Association's organizational activities is its cooperative arrangements with the professional bodies in Jewish education, with the Council of Federations and Welfare Funds, with the Jewish Welfare Board and with other communal and cultural national agencies.

Equally important to communities are the technical services rendered by the Association. To be able to plan an effective and worthwhile community program of Jewish education, a study of child and youth population, of existing facilities and practices and of possible resources becomes imperative. The Association has already helped to make a number of educational surveys in large and small cities and in rural districts, a report of which would prove of interest to Jews not primarily interested in education. A vast sum of educational materials and pedagogic practices is produced and made available in mutual exchange to all Bureaus and educational agencies. Beyond this collection of materials, there is the need for gathering and distributing,

centrally, the elementary facts concerning Jewish educational activity and experience. Nowhere is there to be found comparative information concerning such activity and experience, for which numerous requests are received from local communities. Only on the basis of such information, studies and research, will it be possible to establish and to advance standards for communal efforts in Jewish education, for professional growth, for experimentation and for improved and intensified programs of Jewish education. The recent appointment of Mr. Ben Rosen, editor of the magazine "Jewish Education" and director of the Associated Talmud Torahs of Philadelphia for seventeen years, is added assurance that the technical and organizational activities of the Association will be carried forward with expertness and efficiency.

The American Association for Jewish Education thus becomes a national address for community endeavor in Jewish education. We wish it success in the realization of the ideals to which it is dedicated, the promotion of the cause of Jewish education in the United States, and of the religious and cultural aspects of Jewish life, as well as the cultural and democratic traditions of America.

Because we wish to apprise our readers of the pioneers of this Association and to congratulate these men, we append here the names of its officers. Heading a Board of Governors of over sixty persons from all parts of the country is its President, the Honorable Mark Eisner of New York City. Its secretary is Dr. Israel S. Chipkin. Its Vice Presidents are the Honorable Louis E. Levinthal of Philadelphia, Isidore S. Turover of Washington, D. C., Frank G. Marshall of Chicago, Nathan H. Friedman of Boston, and Charles J. Rosenbloom of Pittsburgh. Mr. Bernard Semel of New York City is its Honorary Secretary and Mr. Harry H. Liebovitz of New York City is its Treasurer.

THE PENDING SOCIAL SECURITY BILL

LATE in 1942 Sir William Beveridge submitted a report on social insurance that attracted considerable attention. On March 10, 1943, President Roosevelt presented to Congress two very significant social documents, "National Resources Development Report for 1943" and "Security, Work and Relief Policies," prepared by the National Resources Planning Board. Acting under the stimulation from these events, on June 3, 1943, Senator Wagner introduced in the Senate of the United States S. 1161, a Bill to amend and extend the provisions of the Social Security Act and to establish a Unified National Social Insurance System. Senator Murray joined Senator Wagner in the introduction of the Bill, and Representative Dingell introduced in the House of Representatives the companion Bill, H. R. 2861.

When the Social Security Act was adopted in 1935, it was generally felt that the measure marked only the beginning of social insurance in the United States, and that, progressive as was the system instituted, its deficiencies were patent and would need to be met in the future. These deficiencies, it is now felt, will become aggravated after the war, and the ounce of prevention must be administered now. What should our planners and legislators anticipate?

First: after the war millions of men and women will be released from the armed forces just at the time when our factories will be shutting down and when many of the plants are being reconverted to civilian production. These men and women will need sources of income until they can find permanent employment. *Second*: Millions of people will need to move from one place to another as plants shut down. During this period of readjustment they will need financial support

in the form of unemployment benefits. *Third*: During the war millions of aged persons have found employment, which they will lose after the war. *Fourth*: Overcrowding and shortage of food and doctors will lead to sickness and, possibly, epidemics. *Fifth*: Millions of persons are not now covered by the Social Security Act of 1935, and after the war the need for this extended coverage will be acute. *Sixth*: Millions of persons are insufficiently covered by the present Act, for the amounts provided as benefits are insufficient to assure an adequate standard of living. *Seventh*: Quite apart from the anticipated post-war sickness problems, millions of people in normal times have no financial protection against the hazards of illness. *Eighth*: The program of survivors' insurance needs strengthening.

The Wagner-Murray-Dingell Bill meets these needs adequately and in a challenging fashion. The most important provisions are the following: (1) all former members of the armed forces will receive an unemployment allowance of $12 a week, plus $6 for each dependent, up to a total of $30 a week, for a maximum of 26 weeks if funds are available; they will be entitled also to all other social insurance benefits on the same conditions as other workers; (1) unemployment benefits begin after a waiting period of one week, and will continue for 26 weeks in the benefit year; the maximum family benefit is $30 per week (today in half the states it is only $15 and in no state is it more than $22); (3) the insured worker, his wife and unmarried children under 18 are entitled to medical care and hospitalization; this will include services of a doctor *chosen by the worker,* and care for as long as needed, services of specialists, laboratory services, eye glasses, and hospitalization for 30 days (or 90 days if funds permit). Just as the individual will have free choice of doctor and hospital, so the doctor will be free to take or reject the patient. Grants-in-aid are also provided for medical research; and the Public Health Service and the Social Security Board are required to submit plans within two years for extending benefits to include dental, home nursing and other services. (4) Maternity benefits, plus six weeks' benefits before and after confinement, to the same extent as unemployment benefits; (5) temporary disability benefits by reason of injury or illness (in addition to medical and hospital care); (6) old-age benefits for men over 65 years of age, and for women over 60, maximum benefit of $120 per month; (7) widows and their children under 18 years of age will receive benefits not to exceed $120 per month; (8) lump-sum death benefits to widow or widower equal to six times the old-age benefit, to pay for burial expenses.

The Bill also provides for the establishment of a Federal United States Employment Service, to be part of the Social Security organization. Also notable is the special public assistance provision, to help needy individuals not covered by the insurance system or lacking sufficient income because of special circumstances or unusual family needs. This class will include the handicapped, the blind, dependent children, and other persons with insufficient incomes. The ceiling on the size of the benefit will be determined by the states, which will receive from 50 percent to 75 percent of the amounts paid out as the Federal Government's contribution, depending on the financial ability of the state as measured by per capita income.

The system will be financed by contributions from the employee's pay-roll, from the employer and from the Federal Government.

The Bill covers everyone in the United States, including the self-employed, except (1) persons in the employ of the United States Government, and (2) persons in the employ of a state or political subdivision thereof, unless assumed by voluntary

compact between the state and the Social Security Board. It also excepts (3) "service performed by a duly ordained or duly commissioned or licensed minister of any church in the regular exercise of his ministry and service performed by regular members of religious orders in the exercise of duties required by such orders."

As to the third exception, we join the editors of "The Synagogue Center," published by the United Synagogue of America, in questioning the wisdom of leaving clergymen without provision. Social security benefits will not make the people of the United States the employees of the Federal Government, and it should not be assumed that the extension of the benefits to clergymen will make churches and synagogues the property of the Government, and clergymen state ministers. In his economic function the minister is a worker; whatever other aspect his vocation may have, the fact remains that he makes (or tries to make) a living from his calling. As a person who is subject to the same economic hazards of life as any one else, he is entitled to the same degree of protection. The Bill should be amended to extend coverage to him.

S. 1161 represents the strongest defense, thus far proposed, against the economic and social evils that lie ahead. It should, without question, be passed as soon as possible.

REALITIES AND VALUES

CONTINUING ITS POLICY OF trying to defame the Jewish community and impugn its loyalty, the Palestinian government instituted a search for arms and for alleged Jewish deserters from the Polish army in the village of Ramat Hakovesh. A number of Jewish settlers were wounded; one of them, Shemuel Wolynetz, died of his wounds. The whole *yishuv* was aroused. The Palestine Jewish press was suspended for publishing an uncensored version of the incident. There were demonstrations all over Palestine. Moshe Shertok, the political head of the Jewish Agency, declared that the *yishuv* would fight all searches for arms "aimed at taking the last means of defense away from the Jews." The *Va-ad Le-umi* (Jewish National Council) decided to send a delegation to London to acquaint the British government and the British people with the facts. There were repercussions also in America. The American Zionist Emergency Council characterized the action of the Palestine government as designed to create an atmosphere in Palestine "calculated to provoke the Jews and ultimately to prejudice the cause of the Jewish national home." It demanded the removal from office of the officials responsible. We may well hope that the latest tyrannical acts of the Palestine government may prove a boomerang. To disarm the Jews who have been Great Britain's "forgotten ally," while leaving the Arabs, who have repeatedly attacked the Jews and rebelled against Great Britain, in possession of their arms, is too blatant a treachery to escape condemnation. A policy that needs such measures to support it cannot long prevail in a democratic country. The White Paper policy cannot stand.

OUR READERS ARE NO DOUBT familiar with the situation in Lebanon from their reading of the general press. The British government has backed the Lebanese demand for immediate independence from France against the contention of the local French authorities that a Mandate from the League of Nations cannot be surrendered without its authorization. We are certainly not opposed to the independence of Lebanon. But the insistence of Great Britain that the independence promised Lebanon must be granted immediately contrasts strangely (or perhaps not so strangely in view of British imperial interests) with the will-

ingness of Great Britain to postpone, until after the war, the solution of the more pressing Jewish problem. But what is our government's interest in supporting the British contention? If it is merely concern for the freedom of the Lebanese and the redemption of pledges made to them, why has not our government been equally concerned with the freedom of the *yishuv* from the arbitrary and discriminatory provisions of the White Paper and with the redemption of Great Britain's pledge to the Jewish people to facilitate the establishment of its national home in Palestine?

▼

SPEAKING BEFORE THE 20TH annual convention of Junior Hadassah, Emanuel Neumann, chairman of the Economic Studies and Planning Committee of the American Zionist Emergency Council, told of a five-year plan being prepared by economic experts in Palestine and America for the settlement of 1,000,000 refugees after the war. Does this sound fantastic in the light of the manifest intention of the Palestine government to stop immigration in accordance with the terms of the White Paper? Well, perhaps. But, on the other hand it may prove that the terms of the White Paper are the more fantastic, that in view of the pressure of Jewish need, the righteousness of the Jewish cause, and the impossibility of any regime in Palestine succeeding without the *yishuv's* cooperation, it will be impossible to carry out the terms of the White Paper. In this connection it is worth noting that nothing has been done to effect the reconstruction plan presented by the Palestine government and opposed by Palestine Jewry because it was based on the White Paper policy. The government cannot obtain the cooperation of the *yishuv* for the project and cannot get along without that cooperation. When the government will again call upon the collaboration of the Jewish Agency on a plan consistent with Jewish rights under the Mandate, it will apparently not find us unprepared.

▼

HEARINGS HAVE BEEN BEGUN before the House Foreign Affairs Committee on the Baldwin-Rogers Joint Resolution calling for a special commission for rescuing Jews from Axis Europe. Attention was called at the hearing to the need of warning Rumania, Bulgaria, Hungary and Vichy France that they would be held responsible for Jews deported into Nazi hands. The hearings brought out the point that it is not enough merely to provide for refugees who have succeeded in escaping from Nazi clutches, as is being done to some extent by the machinery set up by the Bermuda Conference. With the mounting victories of the United Nations' armed forces in Europe, it is becoming more and more obvious that we have contacts with the underground movements in European countries which could be exploited for the rescue of Jews. But the problem is sufficiently difficult and complicated to warrant the appointment of a special commission to deal with it, such as is proposed in the joint resolution. The resolution should be passed. Let your congressmen and senators know that you think so.

▼

AT TWO REGIONAL CONFERences of the Council of Federations and Welfare Funds, one for the West Central States meeting at Kansas City, Mo., and the other for the New England States meeting at Springfield, Mass., the subject of local community organization came up for discussion. In both conferences stress was laid on the need for democratic representation and democratic procedures. It was agreed by the West Central Region at its conference that the community organization would have to be "representative in character and democratic in ac-

tion," and that questions such as civic-protective activity, community planning, Jewish education, and fund-raising for social welfare purposes could plausibly lie within its scope. We approve of such a program for community organization as far as it goes, but it does not go far enough to satisfy us, although it may represent the furthest advance immediately attainable. We should, for example, like to include definitely religious activity as falling within the scope of any communal coordinating agency. Much moreover depends on definition of the term "representative in character." Representative of whom? Are the congregations included in the organizations represented? In many Federations and Community Councils we have this anomalous situation: though the funds are raised largely through the synagogue, the local congregations are not represented, while institutions that spend the funds but do not raise them are represented. That is not our idea of a representative council. These comments must not, however, be construed as opposition to the plans of the Council of Federations and Welfare Funds. We are glad to see their interest in the problem and are confident that good will result from it.

▼

THE GHOST OF LEO FRANK, convicted of the assault and murder of a fourteen-year-old girl in 1943 and lynched by a Georgia mob after the governor of the state, Job M. Slaton, had commuted his sentence because he doubted the fairness of the trial and the correctness of the verdict, has apparently not been laid. He seems still to haunt one Georgia jurist, Arthur G. Powell, who recently announced that he had proof of Frank's innocence. This proof, however, will not be published until "after certain persons are dead." Those who recall the case will recall the anti-Semitic atmosphere of the trial, and the efforts made by Louis Marshall and others to secure Frank's acquittal. His posthumous vindication cannot at this late date undo the mischief that was done. But, in reviving the memory of the case, it may have this good effect on us Jews. It calls our attention to our own stake in the passage of a federal anti-lynching bill. This bill has been defeated time and again on the general theory that the suppression of crime, except against a federal statute or against the Constitution falls within the exclusive jurisdiction of the states. But if lynching is not a federal offense it should be made such. The federal government is charged with insuring to all citizens the rights guaranteed in the Constitution, including the Bill of Rights protecting our civil liberties. But what are these liberties worth, if mobs can nullify them by lynching. That local officials of the states in which such mobs operate are incapable of meeting the situation is proved by the prevalence of lynching. It is therefore reasonable that this subversive action against the fundamental human rights of American citizens guaranteed by the Federal Constitution shall fall within the jurisdiction of federal government agencies.

▼

THERE IS SO MUCH TRAGEDY in the news about our people in Europe, that one welcomes the relief of a comical item like the following: Posing as a Nazi agent, a young Dane demanded the keys of a synagogue in Copenhagen, claiming he had been sent to make a detailed inventory. He returned next morning accompanied by half a dozen porters who removed 43 boxes filled with books and *k'le kodesh*. Thus were the sacred treasures of a Copenhagen synagogue redeemed from the polluting hands of the Nazis. What a wealth of romance and humor future historical novelists will find in the exploits of the underground resistance to Nazism!

Higher Jewish Education and the Emerging Pattern of American Jewry *

By SAMUEL M. BLUMENFIELD

TOGETHER with all other freedom-loving peoples, we lift our longing eyes to the dawn that is to rise upon men and nations when victory comes to the Allies. But along with this hope the heart of every sensitive and thinking Jew is filled with fear at the thought of the desolation to be revealed in European Jewish communities once the curtain of the Gestapo is raised and the smoke of battle is dispelled. The European Jewry we have known and cherished, the cradle of our spiritual and cultural life, is no more. Gone are the Dubnows, Shors, Tzeitlins, Tzierlsohns, Ziegelbaums, Zinbergs, and with them the synagogues, yeshivot, academies, libraries, gymnasia, schools and institutions lovingly and sacrificially created in the course of centuries.

We are still too close to this Jewry and too lacking in perspective to judge its contribution to the sum total of Jewish genius. Future poets and historians, however, will yet relate the remarkable tale of the overflowing creative energy of a Jewry that, within one or two generations, was able to rejuvenate two languages, Yiddish and Hebrew, to contribute immeasurably to Jewish learning and letters through the medium of every civilized tongue and literature, to stand in the forefront of the upbuilding of Jewish Palestine and to enrich every social, political and spiritual endeavor of the non-Jewish world in every land and clime.

For generations to come we shall mourn the untimely and cruel death of two or maybe three million Jewish martyrs and reverently remember the lives, efforts and achievements of the scholars and sages, poets and artists, teachers and leaders of the golden age of the European Jewish renaissance.

The Responsibilities and Opportunities of American Jewry

In keeping with Jewish tradition, we, the orphaned heirs of this great heritage, should do more than mourn our losses. To be worthy of the memory of our European forebears, we shall have to assume courageously the duties and responsibilities hitherto carried by them. This will prove a difficult task, perhaps unprecedented in our entire history. For while upheavals and persecutions dot the pages of the Jewish past, never has a community as young as is American Jewry been called upon to carry the major burdens of a civilization of millennial duration. The downfall of the second commonwealth in Palestine came at a time when there were old and rooted Jewish communities in Babylon and the Graeco-Roman world, which had evolved forms of Jewish living centuries before the Temple was destroyed. The sunset of Babylonian Jewry lingered long enough to give rise to the growth and development of Spanish and Franco-German Jewry. The Crusades, and the medieval persecutions and expulsions which decimated many a Western European Jewish community, were part of a centuries long process that enabled Polish, Russian and other Eastern European Jewries to evolve the type of Jewish culture that lived to our own days.

All these distinct expressions of diaspora Judaism emerged through a slow, age-long succession of adjustment and integration of Jewish belief, thought, and

*From an address delivered at the opening convocation of the Jewish Institute of Religion.

experience with the life and culture of the outside world. Today the Jews of America (as well as of Palestine), under conditions vastly different from those of ancient or medieval times, are called upon to evolve a new pattern of Jewish living within the lifetime of a generation whose beginnings are still rooted in another environment and civilization—indeed, a challenging and staggering enterprise.

Yet the very forces of destruction which have brought about the breakdown of European Jewry, contain within them also the promise of rehabilitation and reconstruction in America, Palestine and possibly in Soviet Russia. The rabbinic adage *"Lefum tza-ara agra,"* ("Suffering has its commensurate reward"), has more than homiletic value; it contains a sociological truth. For the same instruments of technology which brought about the demolition of a Coventry and a Rotterdam have within them also the power and promise for a more rapid reconstruction of the slums of a London or Warsaw. Likewise, the same swift means of communication which hastened the doom of the Jews of Europe can also serve in postwar days to bring the divergent and scattered remnants of our people in closer contact with one another. By virtue of present-day global intercommunication, Jewry can reach even as distant a branch of its religious national tree as the Falashas of Ethiopia much more quickly than it took Hasdai Ibn Shaprut to reach the Jews, and the royal family converted to Judaism, of the land of the Chazars within the borders of Europe.

Neither is this intercommunication limited in effect to the overcoming of physical distances. During the flowering of Franco-German Jewry, it took Rashi years of wanderings in different centers of Jewish learning to find reasonably authentic texts of the Talmud, while to the end of his days he remained uninformed of the Apocryphal books. In order to have a correct copy of the Bible, Rabbenu Gershon had to copy with his own hands the Massoretic source and one of his distinguished disciples, Rabbi Eliezer the Great, never saw the tractate Abodah Zarah because it was not to be found in the Talmudic academy of Mayence. We today have the great advantage of immediate and easy access to a vast storehouse of Jewish literature which even Hitler's burning of books could only sear and scorch, but not consume. Above all, we in America have something which was not given to any other Jewish community in the diaspora, namely, the benefit of intimate knowledge and experience of Jewish life of different lands and different intellectual climes and of different social, economic and spiritual backgrounds. The powers of evil and madness that brought our people to its present tragic plight have also thrown together the lot of a Lubavitcher Rabbi with that of a Judge Proskauer, and the interests of Chaim Weizmann, Dr. Wise and Rabbi Meyer Berlin with those of Professor Solomon Michoels and Col. Itzik Feffer of Soviet Russia.

No student of modern Jewish history can overlook the many and powerful disintegrating forces that operate in Jewish life in a modern democracy like that of the United States. But while we need not underestimate these forces of assimilation, we must not overlook the positive forces that operate in America today for Jewish survival and that were unkown in any other period of Jewish history. I am referring to the acceptance and recognition of the Jewish community, by very virtue of its loyalty to its Jewishness, as a positive social force in America. By this I do not mean recognition of group rights, which was far more prevalent in the ghetto of the Middle Ages. Neither have I in mind intellectual tolerance of Jewish creed and practice on the part of certain liberal circles, which today is not much

more pronounced than in the days of the Encyclopedists or of the French Revolution. I am referring to the new phenomenon of Jewry's becoming accepted in American civilization to the extent that both the American government and society look upon adherence and loyalty to the Jewish group as a positive rather than a negative factor in regard to loyalty to America. I am also referring to the acceptance (as contrasted with tolerance) of Jewish religious expression by American Christian mores, to the extent of inviting Jewish chaplains to minister to the religious needs of non-Jewish combatants.

This is something new in the annals of the Jewish diaspora, and must needs be taken into account in the sum total of forces bearing upon Jewish survival.

But while the American environment contains much that is encouraging to Jewish life, and while positive Jewish human and spiritual forces are abundant in our midst, we have no reason to believe that the sheer momentum of Jewish history can achieve the desired pattern of Jewish living in this country. In the history of our people, it is men of will and genius who helped chart the course of Jewish destiny as true *shuttafim* (co-partners), in "deeds of creation." Many were the architects who helped fashion Jewish life in different lands, but taking Jewish history in its totality, it is correct to say that it is the rabbi, the teacher—rather than the ruler or priest—who assured Jewish survival. Indeed, in Jewish tradition even Moses, the lawgiver and the father of the prophets, is known as *Moshe Rabbenu,* "Moses, our teacher," and the reconstruction of Jewish religious life after the Babylonian exile is associated with Ezra, the leading teacher of his day. Following the destruction of the Second Temple the continuity of Jewish development was assured by the activity of the great teacher, Rabbi Johanan ben Zakkai, who in turn was followed by a galaxy of teachers of Palestinian and Babylonian academies whose tradition of learning and teaching was taken over by the Spanish and Franco-German Jewries, and constituted the cornerstone of Jewish culture until modern times. Education in the case of the Jew is the supreme and tested instrument of his very being; it is therefore repeating a commonplace to state that the future of American Jewry is inextricably bound up with the future of its schools and institutions of learning.

The term *Jewish education* is today associated with the elementary Jewish school, Jewish youth education and programs and activities of a kindred nature known to all who are engaged in the profession. However, for present purposes, I should like to limit the discussion to the field of higher Jewish education. Unlike present-day practices, Jewish education in the past started on the adult level and gradually seeped through to the younger age group. Even in more recent times, it is the academy and the higher institutions of learning that set the goals and the standards which were translated in the curriculum and the practices of the elementary and adolescent levels.

The Programs of Our Seminaries Too Narrow

How is it that with all the idealistic teachers who have come to us from Europe and the many skilled pedagogues trained in America, Jewish education is in its present sorry plight? One of the major reasons for our failures is the fact that to this day no higher institution of Jewish learning has sought to cope earnestly with the problem of Jewish education and to provide the objectives and standards which would guide and inspire the Jewish school. With all the reverence that we hold for the labors and scholarly achievements of our theological seminaries, the fact remains that these schools of higher Jewish learning are first

and foremost intended for the ordination of rabbis and only secondarily as institutions of higher Jewish education. To be sure, yeshivot in the recent past and Jewish academies from days immemorial have had the tradition of ordination, but every student of the history of Jewish education knows that this function was incidental to the more important task of fostering Jewish learning.

The turning of Jewish academies into training grounds for rabbis in Western Europe in modern times was but the logical outcome of a philosophy of Judaism that dates back to the days of the Napoleonic Sanhedrin, namely, that Jewry is a religious sect in no wise different from other sects in Christendom. With such a conception of Jewry and Judaism, it was only natural to stress the functional ritualistic aspect of Jewish religion and to transform the yeshivah of old into an institution for the preparation of experts in Jewish ritual. What is puzzling and disturbing is that here in America this same emphasis on the training for ritualist ministrations and preaching is to be found among men and institutions which repudiate this narrow and obsolete conception of Judaism.

Failure on the part of Jewish theological institutions to cope with the needs of Israel and Torah does not mean that these are being neglected or disregarded. It means rather that they find their fulfilment through instruments and channels that are indifferent and at times inimical to the interests of Jewry and Judaism.

In the course of its checkered history, Jewry has known the sting of traducers and the shame of renegades. It is, however, something new to have within the Jewish community servants of organizations and institutions, who are not only ignorant of the Jewish heritage, but in many instances are actually hostile to it. Obviously, Jewish theological seminaries are not responsible for these pathological phenomena in American Jewish life, but having withdrawn from the field of wider Jewish community interests and problems, they have provided the vacuum which permits the Jewishly indifferent and incompetent to reign supreme. The recital of a few specific instances should help to illustrate the need for wider fields of Jewish studies on the part of our higher institutions of learning.

Soon after war was declared in September, 1939, it became obvious that the Jews would need authentic information on the realities of Jewish life and on problems facing Jewry. Because of this urgent need, a number of organizations vied with one another in the creation of institutes of Jewish studies, with the result that four competing groups have been engaged in the same task of obtaining and presenting information on Jewish life. It is significant that none of the existing institutions of higher Jewish education deemed it necessary to meet the crying need for Jewish information which obviously could have been met more effectively by educational institutions than by partisan organizations.

To take another example—soon after America's entry into the war, the U. S. Government encouraged the formation of an institute devoted to problems of the Near East. As might have been expected, Palestine was one of the important subjects for consideration. But while all other elements interested in the Near East were able to buttress their claims with materials and data accumulated in the course of years by scientific foundations and universities, the Zionist phase of the problem proved to be the most neglected and inadequate. I can say from personal knowledge, that, when one of the scholars, a Jew and a Zionist, who participated in the deliberations, sought to interpret the Zionist case, he was unable to present a single decent piece of literature of the

calibre used by the other contending parties. One may criticize the Zionist movement in America for its shortsightedness and its ineptness in presenting Zionism to the non-Jewish world, but the same criticism may well be directed against those of our institutions of higher learning which profess their love for Zion, yet have done and are doing nothing to provide the knowledge and the understanding which would help redeem Eretz Yisrael.

If a people as rich and a government as powerful as that of the United States do not hesitate to call upon American colleges and universities to share in present war efforts, there is no reason why Jewry, engaged in a war for its very existence, should not receive from its higher educational institutions the services that are readily offered by general schools of higher learning in this country. This criticism should be directed particularly against those Jewish theological institutions which do not envisage their task as being, like that of Christian schools for ministers, concerned primarily with theological issues, but look upon themselves as heirs of the yeshivot of old, which were concerned with meeting the vital spiritual needs of Israel of their times.

Too Little Done for Jewish Education

Perhaps the greatest failure of our institutions of higher Jewish learning is to be found in the sad state of Jewish education in America. The disheartening facts about Jewish education, or, to be more exact, about the lack of Jewish education among our young and old, poor and rich, our uneducated and, particularly, our educated Jews, are too well known to bear repetition. The problem of elementary education is left to the devices of individual schools or organizations. The little that is being done nationally to salvage Jewish youth from Jewish ignorance and indifference, is carried on by such organizations as the B'nai B'rith, Zionist groups and similar lay bodies without the help and guidance from any institution of higher Jewish learning. It is well known that the education of youth is one of the most difficult problems of our age; yet there is not a single Jewish theological seminary that has coped with the task of cultivating Jewish intelligence and loyalty among Jewish youth. (Only recently has one of the seminaries begun to give some attention to adult Jewish education, but so far the efforts have been limited and only tangential to its main activities.) A problem that is not yet widely known, but which touches the very heart of Jewish education in America, is the fact that we are losing our Jewish pedagogues, judging by the great shortage of teachers, principals, educational youth workers and directors in Jewish schools, centers, youth organizations and kindred institutions. This shortage is not due so much to war conditions as to the fact that American young Jews and Jewesses have for some time shunned Jewish education as a profession. The requirements of a Hebrew teacher are in many ways not unlike those of the rabbinic student, yet American Jewry does not provide any incentive that would encourage able young men and women to choose Jewish education as their life work. As a student, the future Hebrew teacher is not granted the privileges extended to students of theological seminaries, and as a graduate he must shift for himself, without support or encouragement from anyone. His salary is lower than that of the public school teacher, and he is not granted the opportunity for growth, security of tenure and vacations extended to the teacher in the public school. As long as such conditions prevail there is no hope for the Jewish education profession in this country, and much sooner than we realize, Jewish communities will revert to the practices of a half a century ago when the un-

trained, inexperienced, and "unsuccessful" engaged in Jewish education.

Here is a problem that touches the vitals of American Jewry; indeed it bears directly upon the future of the American rabbi, both in regard to his own Jewish training and the training of his future congregation. But the whole subject of Jewish education, if it holds any place at all in Jewish theological institutions, is treated as a step-child to be overlooked or forgotten when the first obstacle or difficulty presents itself.

The place that Jewish education should hold in our theological seminaries and the methods to be used in dealing with educational problems require earnest study and careful consideration. One of our colleagues recently suggested that the rabbi should act as the supreme authority in all matters pertaining to Jewish community affairs, including Jewish edution. Surely one does not achieve a position of authority by neglecting fields in which one is to offer opinion or pass judgment. Personally, I question very seriously whether the rabbi should be taxed with the burden of doing more and more while learning less and less. Considering the character of American civilization and its achievements by means of specialization, one should give earnest consideration to the possibility of the training of rabbis in specialized fields such as preacher, educator, and social or community worker. With a broader conception of the function of the rabbinate, the curriculum of Jewish theological institutions might be so arranged that the first two years of training be devoted to basic studies of Hebrew language and literature, Biblical and post Biblical literature and history, and the last two years to specialized studies in Jewish law, synagogue practice, preaching, social and community service, and elementary, youth, and adult Jewish education. (It is significant that the Catholic Church in America does not hesitate to assign to one of its outstanding bishops the task of supervising the athletic program of its youth.) To meet prevailing Jewish tradition, it may be desirable to grant ordination to those who are to serve the synagogue, and doctorates in Hebrew letters to those who intend to serve other fields. In view of the lower standards of Jewish education of the congregational Hebrew school as compared with that of the community Talmud Torah, it may also be advisable to emulate the example of the University of Chicago and provide undergraduate courses for younger students in order to guide more effectively their secular and Jewish studies.

Denominationalism in Our Higher Institutions of Learning

There is still one other issue that faces higher Jewish education and surpasses in importance even those already raised, for it touches upon the very essence of the emerging pattern of American Jewry. I am referring to the spirit of denominationalism which still characterizes practically all institutions of higher Jewish learning in America. Emancipation and Jewish Reform in Germany made the unity that had previously prevailed among the rabbinical yeshivot impossible. As a result we have our present divisions represented by the Reform, Orthodox and Conservative theological seminaries. But while there was ample historic justification for the creation of such institutions in Western Europe a century ago (and in America about half a century ago), we may question the moral right of our theological seminaries to encourage and perpetuate such divisions in the future.

Solomon Schechter, already at the beginning of this century, realized the evils of excessive Jewish denominationalism. In one of his addresses concerning the

Jewish Theological Seminary he made it clear that his aim was not to accentuate differences, but to level them down, by stating, "You know my conservative tendencies both in life and in thought, but I am thoroughly convinced that if the seminary is to become a real blessing it must not be degraded as a battle-ground for parties. It must above all give direction to both Orthodoxy and Reform." It is to be regretted that, far from following this ideal, institutions of higher Jewish education have sought to build and strengthen denominational loyalties. I am not referring to honest differences of opinion which were always to be found in Jewish life and thought and which have their legitimate place in our midst today. Such differences sharpen and quicken Jewish thought and enrich Jewish experience. But it is one thing for institutions to reflect different views and ideals and it is another for so-called ideals to reflect the vested interests of institutions.

Jewish life in America has gone a long way towards the crossing of boundaries of religious differences. The sons and daughters of parents who considered, only a generation ago, a liberal congregation to be anathema, very often preside over the affairs of these very liberal synagogues and institutions; and men and women who only a decade ago shunned every contact with traditional or Zionist elements today share readily and effectively in the burdens of Jewish community responsibility. It is no longer shocking to find, particularly in smaller communities where the process of adjustment to environment is achieved at greater pace, families belonging at one and the same time to Orthodox, Reform and Conservative congregations. Granted that these realities are frequently the result of Jewish ignorance and social opportunism, they are nevertheless motivated, consciously or unconsciously, by a belief in and a desire for a united Israel. What is even more significant is that the rabbis who are the spokesmen and interpreters of different Jewish religious schools of thought have in recent years found it possible time and again to share in their common tasks and problems. All over the country there have sprung up rabbinical organizations representing either all the three or at least two of the wings in Jewish religious life. A United Synagogue Council in which Orthodox, Reform and Conservative rabbis act as one united body would have been inconceivable a half a century ago, and a joint annual conference of two national rabbinical organizations would have been impossible even a quarter of a century ago. These attempts at bridging barriers in Jewish life are not limited to religious aspects of Jewish life alone, but are part of a process of integration of Jewish positive forces along social, economic and ideological lines.

In stating these facts, it is not my intention to depict a Utopia in American Jewry. Judging by our age-long experience, I am sure that for generations to come, even unto eternity, we shall have differences in our midst. Such are indeed inevitable in a religious culture that emphasizes the right and the contribution of minority opinion as it does those of the majority. While following the dicta of Hillel, Jewish tradition never fails to record reverently the opinion of Shammai, and while Rabbi Eliezer ben Hyrkanus was temporarily in excommunication, declared both his words and those of his opponents to be *"divre elohim hayyim."* ("words inspired by God.") But while differences reflecting Jewish thought and experience in America should be welcomed in our midst, they must arise as a result of genuine divergent concepts of the destiny of the Jew. The Jewish community in America is as yet too young for articulate and spiritual differences arising from

the new set of conditions and experiences on American soil, but it is mature enough to seek to rid itself of distinctions and divisions that were brought to this land from other shores and different backgrounds. There is every indication that American Jewry is ripe for a "revaluation of values" that were brought from another environment, but to this day there is not the institution of learning ready to rise above its immediate preoccupation with minutiae in order to translate the yearning for *kelal yisrael* into a Jewish life.

There is need today for an institution of higher Jewish education which would incorporate the best of both the traditional and the liberal academies of European Jewry and would above all be sensitive to the issues, problems and opportunities of Jewry in America.

The Role of Love and Hate in Our Ethical Life

By THEODORE FRIEDMAN

"One verse declares: Remember what Amalek did unto thee by the way when ye came forth from Egypt. . . . Therefore . . . thou shalt blot out the rememberance of Amalek. Another verse declares: Thou shalt not abominate the Edomite for he is thy brother. How can these two verses be fulfilled?" (Midrash).

"We shall hate or perish." (Rex Stout).

"Hate is moral poison." (William Bowie).

PITY the poor moralist. Time and circumstances have again conspired to confound him in his absolutes. He has, as so often, been neatly trapped, caught between stark necessity and desirability. Hate and love have moved in on him from opposite directions with their irrefutable but seemingly contradictory demands.

First, hate. To argue that a war can be prosecuted without engendering rancor is not simply fatuous; it is downright immoral. He who kills in a cold, calculating, mechanical fashion is, so says the law, a murderer in the first degree; he who kills in a passion is a murderer in the second degree. Legalism aside, the military men know that hatred and a burning desire for revenge put a sharp edge on a fighting man's efficiency. Among the most daring units in the RAF are reported to be the Poles seeking revenge for Warsaw and their devastated homeland. No amount of dialectic can upset the simple proposition that a good hater is a good fighter. If we mean to win the war, then we must face up to the fact that hate is a weapon. Not even the arsenal of democracy can dispense with it.

If hate is a non-expendible, one certainly cannot conceive of the Jewish ethic without the principle of brotherly love. One need go no further in citing proof texts than to quote Rabbi Akiba's classic comment on the verse: "And thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." For Akiba this injunction of Leviticus was the "great rule" or, as we would put it, the fundamental principle of the Torah. To conclude, as did Ahad Ha-am, that the Jewish ethic, in contradistinction to the Christian ethic, is essentially one of justice rather than love is to wave aside a large and normative part of Jewish moral teaching. What is one to do, for example, with Hillel's exhortation to be a lover of one's fellow men? The merest tyro in the field of Jewish ethics can pile up text upon text, injunction upon injunction bespeaking brotherly love. The three words of the Psalmist will suffice: *"Olam hesed yibbaneh,"* ("The world will be built up by loving-kindness.")

Properly speaking, neither hate nor love

is a moral principle, a guide to action. They are human emotions and as such incitements, spurs to action. They are both necessary and both are to be cultivated—one to induce us to act justly, the other to galvanize us into the destruction of evil. If justice is the affirmative response to the legitimate needs of our fellow men, then it takes brotherly love to bestir us into making such response. To clothe the naked, feed the hungry, shelter the homeless is the work of justice, as the Prophets properly described it. Only a warm and moving sense of the love of man can dispose us to rise to the level of justice. Hate too has its part to play. The attack upon evil springs from a hatred of it and of all its works. Unless men be taught to hate evil and hate it fiercely, they may grow soft and accommodating. Evil may become a "matter of taste" or some other people's "internal affair." Certainly the Prophets need no lessons in justice from any man, nor for that matter in human compassion. And yet, the prophetic personality could, on the proper occasion, express the mood of hate in all its ultimate intensity. So hate too has a place and an important place in the moral vocabulary. It is the moral dynamic in the onslaught against the encroachments of evil. To ask men to forswear hate out of loyalty to the supposedly higher motive of love is to fail to recognize the parallel functions of both love and hate in the moral life. One points man to the struggle against injustice, the other sends him out to the performance of deeds of justice.

Hate is neither moral poison nor the sole prerequisite of survival. It is an essential stimulus towards the crushing of that which stands in the way of man's survival on the level of human dignity. Once that task has been fulfilled, the path will have been cleared for the reconstruction of society in the image of justice.

"How shall these two verses be fulfilled," asks the Midrash? Honesty prompts the confession that, despite our best effort at the resolution of the moral dilemma, much remains to be answered. The very fact that the pursuit of justice must inevitably, as we have sought to indicate, involve us in contradictory moods is in itself a perplexing matter. But in logic, avers Prof. Whitehead, a contradiction is a fatality, in life it is an opportunity. It is not otherwise in the realms of religion and morals. Thus, our Midrash, in reply to the dilemma it has uncovered, falls back on the answer that God alone can utter two such verses and yet not be guilty of self-contradiction. We mortals must seize both ends of the dilemma and give our hearts and minds to the bidding of the Psalmist: "O ye who love the Lord, hate evil."

Music Notes

By JUDITH K. EISENSTEIN

A Salute to Leonard Bernstein

WE hope this week to have the pleasure of hearing Leonard Bernstein conduct the Philharmonic Orchestra in the playing of Ernest Bloch's "Three Jewish Poems." It was not this writer's good fortune to be present at Mr. Bernstein's spectacular debut when he was called to the podium at short notice to take the place of Bruno Walter. The tale in the newspapers, bearing all the earmarks of a good old-fashioned

scenario, warmed the cockles of our heart, as it undoubtedly did the hearts of most readers. The various interviews published subsequently reveal Mr. Bernstein as an ingratiating young personality, as well as an accomplished musician and composer; so the story rounds out to everyone's satisfaction.

At the risk of incurring a barrage of allusions to the old joke about the elephant and the Jewish problem, and at the risk of causing embarrassment to a young man already overwhelmed with a sudden publicity, this writer wishes to go on record as having enjoyed a special and intense heartwarming over this bit of fairy tale in a mad and gruesome world. Our readers probably felt it too, and since all of us together have lacked this sorely for a long time, we may as well express our gratitude.

For Leonard Bernstein has behaved very strangely, very strangely indeed as a new celebrity. What did he tell his host of interviewers representing the length and breadth (or should we say the height and depth), of the press? Along with his modest description of his background and accomplishments he informed them that he has written a symphony entitled "Jeremiah," dedicated to his own suffering people. (This symphony, by the way, is to be performed for the first time by the Pittsburgh Symphony Orchestra on January 28.) And moreover, what does Mr. Bernstein do, at his very next appearance as conductor, this time at a planned appearance? He proposes to conduct "three *Jewish* pieces." This spectacle of courage and loyalty from a new source—alas, that it should be so unusual! —calls for acknowledgment.

It would be interesting to know what elements in the young man's home background and education led to this kind of behavior. Education might like to isolate the factor and try to reproduce it, to inject it into veins of a still newer generation. Can it be that Mr. Bernstein doesn't realize the extent of his courage, and the rarity of his loyalty? Can it be that he has been so protected in his earnest devotion to his art, that he doesn't know that he has stuck his neck out? Does he know that the great patrons of the muses, the Jewish ones, will soon be nervously wiping off their fingertips on their napkins and rising from the banquet table to leave for safer and saner repasts? Be careful, Mr. Bernstein. You will have to write a great deal of Americana and perhaps even a little church music to reassure them. Even then you may not succeed, because you are already tainted.

Older and more experienced artists have learned this, and have learned to hold their peace. There are, of course, one or two notable exceptions, but by and large our Jewish musicians make themselves known as Russians, Poles, Frenchmen, not as Jews. Indeed, once in a while those who have the knowledge and background will feel stirrings of conscience. They would like to do their bit by the Jews. They will appeal to the rank and file organizations of Jewry, and say, "Make me an opportunity. I would sing Hebrew songs. I would play Jewish music on my violin. Just for you, my friends, just for you." But in Town Hall, and in Carnegie Hall, when they are facing critics and a critical public, not made up exclusively of a Jewish cheering section, they will not include a few of these Hebrew songs, these Jewish violin pieces. They might sing Russian, or Italian or German. They might play a final group of light little experimental numbers by unknown composers. But there is no Jewish group. That would cause discomfiture to the great ones.

Sometimes the musicians admit this to be the reason. Sometimes they offer most remarkable pretexts. One artist said to us

recently, "It would not be right to sing in German and Hebrew on the same program. They are antipathetic." So specious and insincere an argument does not merit rebuttal. Another has told us, "I must maintain my esthetic standards at all times. There is no Jewish music that meets them. I dare not subjugate my art to my national feeling." Take a moment, dear reader, to examine the program of almost any recital any week in New York. See whether each composition there will be sure to suit the impeccable taste of the lofty connoisseur. See whether there aren't a few items which may be good show-off materials, which may throw a sop to the fashionable thirst for Latin-Americana, or may tickle the palate of the sophisticated boogie-woogie fan.

On the other hand, observe the programs of a Hayes, or a Robeson, or a Maynor or an Anderson. Will you find one that does not include the inevitable group of Negro spirtuals? We shall all feel let down if it did not. The spirituals are beautiful and the Negro artists find themselves gloriously at home in them. They are not the greatest music in song literature. Is it really possible that we have no song, at least as lovely and meaningful? Have we, out of our centuries, no synagogue song, no simple folk song, no single art song that deserves a modest place in the corner of a program on the concert stage?

The artists—those of them who began with Jewish knowledge, and self-respect and loyalty—lost all that with varying degrees of speed. After all, musicians are not really super-men. Their gifts do not necessarily include the talent for living without nourishment, either physical or spiritual. Many of them give up only after a struggle against overwhelming odds. Those who have stormed the citadels of the great patrons have learned that the great ones "believe in music as the universal language"; that "we mustn't be narrow and chauvinistic in this greatest of all arts." (That is, unless we are Czech or Mexican perhaps). And these are the polite patrons. The others say rudely and abruptly, "I am not interested in Jewish music" and drop the telephone receiver. Concert managers and press agents won't touch a tainted program at a fee. They know their stuff. They are not anti-Semites or Nazi agents. They are just in business, and can't take fantastic risks.

Yes, Mr. Bernstein is either very courageous, or very naive. His press agent, if he has one, didn't get to his side fast enough to take care of him. And now, God help him, and God help us all, if this new Jeremiah Symphony of his does not turn out to be the greatest composition since Beethoven. The patrons will trip over each other in their haste to escape, and don yet another cloak of protective coloration. The Jews on the fence, who've been peering over to see if Jewish culture is pretty enough to play with, will slip right over the fence and follow their masters. The good-will Jews will shake their heads mournfully, murmur, "a strategic error," and hurry to finance a great Christian oratorio. And Mr. Bernstein who stuck his neck out—ah, permit us to mix our metaphors, please—will be left out on a limb.

A salute to you, Leonard Bernstein. Your own people in America are not really suffering so badly. Many of them are just shaking a little inside their stuffed shirts and mink coats. May we rise to your example of courage and loyalty.

Book Notes

THE DEVIL AND THE JEWS, Joshua Trachtenberg, Yale University Press, New Haven, Conn., 1943, 279 pp.

TO a degree, every human mind is a "land unknown and unknowable" to every other. Though men possess in common a currency of public words and concepts, there remain in every individual, both in association with these words and beyond their reach, private colorations, peculiar nuances, and unique associations. If this be true of persons who partake together of a particular time, space, language, and culture, how much truer must it be of individuals who people diverse civilizations. And how much higher and broader must be the wall of separateness which divides any given historical epoch from others.

These reflections are occasioned by my reading Dr. Joshua Trachtenberg's *The Devil and the Jews.* For as I turned the learned and absorbing pages of this volume, a sense of mounting incredulity was engendered in me. I had known, to be sure, as an abstract proposition, that the medieval mind was different in tone and temper from the modern. But never had I perceived so clearly the radical nature of that difference. Once I was aware of it, I could not help drawing the inference that something of the same diversity of spirit, the same peopling of different psychic worlds must prevail today between men of good will and emotionally driven anti-Semites.

Needless to say, it is not Rabbi Trachtenberg's major interest to make this or any analagous point. His purpose is directly to exhibit how the Christians of the Middle Ages conceived of the Jews and whence their conception was derived. But whatever his objective, not the least of the virtues of his work is the insight it affords in the distinctiveness of the medieval mind from our own and the implication of similar radical differences, though in lesser measure, among modern men.

How, then, did Gentiles a half millenium ago envisage Jews? The actual Jews of their time, it would seem, they virtually knew not at all. Instead they saw stereotypes, mythical creatures of their own imaginations or the projections of the culture in which they lived. Jews were to them, as Rabbi Trachtenberg demonstrates beyond challenge, the Devil incarnate, the anti-Christ, servants of Satan, sorcerers, magicians, poisoners, desecrators of the sacred objects of Christian worship, ritual murderers, drinkers of Christian blood, infidels, heretics, and the befouling well-spring of heretical beliefs. It is difficult for us to associate such ugly obsessions with the simple, decent, and learned Jews whom we know our ancestors to have been. But, then, is it any easier to bridge the gap between Streicher's image of us and the people we are in all reality? Dr. Trachtenberg does more than describe the picture of Jews as Christian fancy drew it. He undertakes to show whence each feature in the portrait was derived. And he proves that among the many forces which led to so unhappy a conclusion, the largest and most persistent was pretty generally the Church, not always the leaders of the

Church, which sometimes resisted the trend of popular thought, but the Church as a whole nonetheless. In the end, therefore, it is at the doors of organized Christendom that responsibility must be laid for the fact that Gentiles came to be blind to actual Jews and to see in their stead a malicious and gargoyle-like caricature.

Perhaps it should be added that, though *The Devil and the Jews* is a scholarly work replete with all the apparatus of academic learning, the reader should not be deterred by that fact from approaching it. He will find it vivid, colorful, and absorbing.

And pertinent too. For medieval conceptions of Jews are far from irrelevant to our own life and time. As Rabbi Trachtenberg twice indicates, once at the beginning of his volume and again at the end, the notions of Jews entertained in days gone by live on in Gentile minds to the present, constituting a prime contributant to the dynamism of contemporary anti-Semitism. Indeed, in this book there is the key to one of the mysteries of modern prejudice against the Jews. Obviously, economics and sociology do not altogether explain the anti-Semitism we experience. There is, in the attitude to Jews, a passion and a frenzy not to be made comprehensible in terms of the normal factors of group life. This element, which Maurice Samuel called the demonological, now finds an explanation. If anti-Semitism today be an obsession and a hysteria, it is such in no slight measure because it derives from and is infused with that medieval hysterical obsession which Rabbi Trachtenberg describes.

This, then, is the highest meed of praise which can be accorded to *The Devil and the Jews*. It is not only sound scholarship and good literature; it illuminates brilliantly one aspect of an age gone by and so throws reflected light on that era in which we live.

MILTON STEINBERG

IN THE STEPS OF MOSES, by Louis Golding. The Jewish Publication Society, Philadelphia. 556 *pp.* $2.50.

LOUIS GOLDING, the eminent novelist and essayist, was given a fascinating assignment—to follow in the steps of Moses and to reconstruct the events of the great Lawgiver's life. "In the Steps of Moses" is the record of the journey made by Golding, begun in Egypt, and continued to the Red Sea, the Sinaitic desert, Mt. Sinai, Edom and all the other places which mark the stages of Moses' journey in the Biblical narrative. It is a book in which archeology, Biblical narrative and aggadic legends are interwoven, in an attempt not only to trace the journey of Moses but to rediscover the historic Moses and the living reality behind the man. Golding is plainly in love with the Biblical Moses and the Moses of folklore, and tries to recreate what the archeologist can at best uncover. As a journey into the historic past, Golding's wanderings may have been fruitless, but the reader will find in this volume other beguiling by-paths which will keep him interested. Golding knows how to write and how to tell a story. As a book of travel in hallowed lands, which the war has brought so close to us today, as a tale of adventure, as the story of the way of an amateur historian with ruins and archeologists, as a review of the Bible story and as a recreation of the aggadic Moses, "In the Steps of Moses," is well worth reading. The book originally appeared in England in two volumes and this single volume, brought out by the Jewish Publication Society, has been slightly condensed. Despite its condensation, the book is still too long and occasionally tedious, and should be read leisurely, the way the Israelites journeyed in the wilderness, and taken with a grain of Egyptian sand.

SAMUEL DININ

CORRESPONDENCE

Jewish Content Not Hebrew Language Essential

Sirs:

Dr. Chomsky devotes a paragraph in his article to an examination of the relationship between Judaism and the Hebrew language in terms of historical evolution and social psychology. He points out, very correctly, that the Hebrew people adopted the "Hebrew" language from the Canaanites. Although no particular attachment toward it was felt at first, it did gradually become "the vesture of their inmost thoughts and emotions."

What Dr. Chomsky overlooks is that the language which our people at one time approached with no particular emotion, fell in love with and became inseparably related to has ceased to register the emotion it once granted, among a very great proportion of American Jewry.

Historically the Hebrew language served three main purposes: as the spoken tongue, as the language of our literature and instruction in that literature, and as the language of worship and liturgy. Today, however, it is an incontrovertible fact that Hebrew has virtually ceased to be the living tongue of American Jewry. that it no longer serves as the medium of literary expression for the overwhelming majority of American Jews who write what constitutes our American Jewish literature, that it is not the language in which the sources of Judaism and our sacred literature are read and studied today by the masses of American Jewry and finally, it is steadily declining as the language of the Synagogue as English makes greater and greater inroads in the average service.

The Hebrew language in America, unlike in Palestine, has been on the "death bed" for many years now. We must strive as much as possible to revive the Hebrew language and extend its use here in America. But I say, too; even if the patient does die, Judaism will live.

The theory that Hebrew is indispensable to Judaism implies that if Hebrew should fail to survive, Judaism would be lost to civilization. The evidence I have marshalled makes me feel it is not at all necessary to accept this pessimistic conclusion.

Some Hebraists seem to feel that the Hebrew language is the distinctive feature of Judaism. They are confident that, if we translate or paraphrase that which is of permanent and universal value in Jewish literature, its Jewish uniqueness will be shed and its distinctiveness dissipated. The Hebrew language makes it uniquely Jewish. I maintain that the sublime thinking, the great wisdom, the profound philosophy and the beautiful idealism which make up our heritage constitute the life-thought of our people and reflect a distinctive Jewish attitude and spirit.

Dr. Chomsky maintains that a "translated" Judaism is doomed to extinction and eventually leads to complete assimilation of our people. He cites as historical evidence the case of the Alexandrian Jewish community. But if we can trust the opinion of such outstanding students of Jewish history today as Prof. Alexander Marx, Dr. Max Margolis and Dr. Meyer Waxman, then we cannot question the contributions of Alexandrian Jewry to Judaism and their unflinching devotion and loyalty to Jewish life. (Margolis and Marx, "History of the Jewish People," pp. 128-139; Waxman, "History of Jewish Literature," vol. I., pp. 88 ff).

Much of the original tone, color imagery, etc., is undeniably lost in the process of translation. However, the time has come in the evolution of American Jewish culture when rabbis, educators and scholars must tackle seriously the tremendously important problem of "translating" Judaism into the mother tongue of American Jews and must determine to educate a generation of intelligent, informed and creative Jews.

If we continue our attempts to achieve both content and language training simultaneously, we shall, I am afraid, achieve neither with any measure of real satisfaction. When it comes to a choice, then the work to be done in the area of content exceeds in importance that of the work to be done in the field of language, I believe.

Dr. Chomsky regards my case as a defeated one because I used what he terms that "atomistic" approach rather than the "field" concept which he proposes. He accuses me of regarding Judaism as the sum of the various elements of which it is composed rather than as an integration or fusion of those elements.

But to examine intensely one aspect of a unit, as I did, does not *ipso facto* deny its relationship to other social phenomena. We can still discuss race cultures without bringing in a whole complex of considerations which must have borne in on them throughout a history going back and back and back.

I heartily agree with Dr. Chomsky that Judaism is rooted in the Hebrew language. However, I deny that Judaism has but one root. Its roots are many and they draw sustenance and vitality from more than one source: profound philosophy, morality, wisdom, ritual and other practices of the past; problems and conditions of the present; and the indomitable will of the people to survive and remain creatively, intelligently and wholesomely Jewish in the future. Educators and "technicians" in Judaism must dig deeper into some of these latter sources to draw from them the nurture which will satisfy the hunger of American Jewry for a richer and more meaningful Judaism.

LOUIS BARISH,
Rabbi, Congregation Beth Sholom,
Kilgore, Texas.